



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/759,370 | 01/15/2004 | Fu-Yen Tseng | 14178 B | 1500 |

36672 7590 01/18/2006

CHARLES E. BAXLEY, ESQ.
90 JOHN STREET
THIRD FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10038

EXAMINER

TRUONG, BAO Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,370

Applicant(s)

TSENG ET AL

Examiner

Bao Q. Truong

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, "a light emitting diode display" in line 3 should be changed to --the light emitting diode display--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

"the LCD display 10" in line 2 page 5 should be changed to --the light emitting diode display 10--; and all "LED display 10" should be changed to --light emitting diode display 10-- for consistency.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2875

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parikka [US 6,592,233].

Regarding claim 1, Parikka discloses a display having a light guide plate [20], a light emitting diode display [100], a display screen [120], and a light source [50] (abstract, figures 2A-2C).

Regarding claim 6, Parikka discloses the light source [50] at a side of the light guide plate [20] (figure 2A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parikka in view of Ahn et al. [US 2004/0070966].

Regarding claims 2-5, Parikka discloses a light source [50] but does not clearly disclose the LED, the SMD lamp and the circuit board.

Ahn et al. teach the use of the LED, the SMD LED and the circuit board [66] (figures 6-8, column 2 paragraph [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the light source of Parikka with the LED, the SMD LED and the circuit board in the lighting display device as taught by Ahn et al. for purpose of providing an advantageous way of saving electrical energy, decreasing light weight, and increasing lifetime.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parikka in view of Mari-Roca et al. [US 5,390,085].

Regarding claim 7, Parikka discloses the light guide plate [20] being defined as a main visual screen and a light source [50], but does not disclose the main visual screen being provided at both sides with extension and the reflection plate being between the main visual screen and the extension.

Mari-Roca et al. teaches the use of a light guiding plate with extension at both side and a reflection plate [208] being therebetween (figure 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the light guiding plate of Parikka with the extension at both side and a reflection plate being therebetween in the lighting display device as taught by Mari-Roca et al. for purpose of providing a uniform illumination to an information being displayed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 02 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner believes that the limitation "a light emitting diode display" recited in claim 1 is still "a display", which is disclosed in Parikka '233 as rejected above.

Moreover, the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the light emitting diode display in the present invention is an actively emissive display which can generate light source by itself) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In view of above, claim 1 and its dependency are still unpatentable.

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2875


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bao Q. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2383. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra L. O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bao Q. Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2875


ALI ALAVI
PRIMARY EXAMINER